

REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 17, 2011. Claims 2-4, 6-9, and 13 are presented for examination, of which Claims 2 and 13 are in independent form. Claims 11 and 14 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter presented therein. Claims 3 and 8 have been amended purely as to matters of form, and not to overcome any rejection. Claims 2, 7, and 13 have been amended to define aspects of what Applicants regard as their invention more clearly. Support for the claim amendments may be found, for example, in FIGS 5A, 5B, 5C, and 6A, and in the descriptions thereof in the specification.¹ Favorable reconsideration is requested.

As an initial matter, Applicants have noted a typographical error in the listing of one of the documents cited in the Information Disclosure Statement dated December 7, 2010. More particularly, the reference listed as “JP 200~~3~~-373130 A” should have been listed as “JP 200~~2~~-373130 A.” The corrected Form PTO-1449 submitted herewith correctly identifies that reference. Copies of “JP 200~~2~~-373130 A” and an English translation thereof were submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement of December 7, 2010. It is respectfully requested that an initialed copy of the corrected Form PTO-1449 be returned indicating that the document has been considered.

The Office Action rejects Claims 2-4, 7-9, 11, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0167974 (*Bunn et al.*); and rejects Claim 6 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bunn et al.* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0050963 (*Lamming et al.*). Cancellation of Claims 11 and 14 renders their rejections moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and submit

¹ Any examples presented herein are intended for illustrative purposes and are not to be construed to limit the scope of the claims.

that independent Claims 2 and 13, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art.

Claim 2 is directed to a wireless communication device that includes a network detection unit, a network connection unit, a printer searching unit, a network changing unit, a display unit, an aborting unit, and a printer connection unit. The network detection unit detects a plurality of wireless networks. The network connection unit connects to one or more of the wireless networks detected by the network detection unit. The printer searching unit searches within each wireless network connected to by the network connection unit for one or more printers having a predetermined print function.

Notably, when the printer searching unit completes searching for the printers having the predetermined print function within a wireless network connected to by the network connection unit, the network changing unit changes the wireless network connected to by the network connection unit to another wireless network detected by the network detection unit, to search for one or more printers having the predetermined print function within the other wireless network connected to by the network connection unit. Every time the printer search unit detects a printer having the predetermined print function, the display unit selectably displays printer information associated the printer. When an operator selects a printer associated with information displayed by the display unit, the aborting unit aborts the searching by the printer searching unit. When an operator selects the printer associated with the information displayed by the display unit, the printer connection unit connects to a wireless network including the selected printer and also connects to the selected printer.

Bunn et al. is understood to relate to a method for “exposing” mobile-enterprise printers on a network (*see* Abstract). In *Bunn et al.*, the method includes receiving a request to

identify a print service, identifying a print service in the network, and identifying a printer device in the network (*see* Abstract). Nothing in *Bunn et al.* is understood to teach or suggest that, when searching for the mobile-enterprise printers in the network completes, a connection is changed to another network and the other network is searched for the mobile-enterprise printers. Additionally, nothing in *Bunn et al.* is understood to teach or suggest that, when an operator selects a printer device associated with displayed information, searching for the mobile-enterprise printers is aborted and connections are made to a network including the selected printer device and to the selected printer device.

More particularly, nothing has been found in *Bunn et al.* is that is believed to teach or suggest a wireless communication device that includes, among other things, “a network changing unit adapted to, when the printer searching unit completes searching for the one or more printers having the predetermined print function within a wireless network connected to by the network connection unit, change the wireless network connected to by the network connection unit to another wireless network detected by the network detection unit, to search for the one or more printers having the predetermined print function within the other wireless network connected to by the network connection unit,” as recited in Claim 2. Additionally, nothing has been found in *Bunn et al.* is that is believed to teach or suggest a wireless communication device that includes, among other things, “an aborting unit adapted to abort the searching by the printer searching unit, when an operator selects a printer associated with information displayed by the display unit,” and “a printer connection unit adapted to, when the operator selects the printer associated with the information displayed by the display unit, connect to one of the plurality of wireless networks including the selected printer and connect to the selected printer,” as recited in Claim 2. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 2 is not

anticipated by *Bunn et al.*, and therefore withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

A review of *Lamming et al.* has failed to reveal anything that is believed to remedy the deficiencies of *Bunn et al.* identified above. Accordingly, Claim 2 is believed to be patentable over the cited art, whether considered separately or in combination.

Independent Claim 13 includes features sufficiently similar to those of Claim 2 that Claim 13 is believed to be patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. The other rejected claims in the present application depend from Claim 2 and are submitted to be patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and an early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/John Wakeley/

John Wakeley
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 60,418

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200